



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Frost
Serial No.: 10/823,079
Filing Date: April 13, 2004
Title: Modular Valve Assembly

Examiner: John Bastianelli
Group A.U.: 3751

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

The applicant has received the Office Action dated April 3, 2006. Unfortunately, the applicant is extremely confused at this point in the prosecution process. Enclosed under Exhibit A, the Examiner will find Office Action dated December 19, 2005 which raised many of the identical issues provided in this Office Action. Enclosed under Exhibit B is the applicant's response wherein election of Group I was made.

The applicant's attorney has no record of a discussion on March 30, 2006 requiring an election requirement of this case. Written election was made as enclosed by Exhibit B on January 12, 2006. A postcard showing receipt by the Patent Office was returned to the applicant. It appears that the Examiner may be confusing this case with another as will be described in detail below.

Drawings Rejection

The Examining Attorney stated: "The drawings appear to be handwritten and the examiner cannot understand the operation of the device." (emphasis) The drawings are primarily